



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov

410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-1655

TDD 410-313-2323

August Minutes

Thursday, August 6, 2015; 7:00 p.m.

The seventh regular meeting for the year 2015 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, July 2, 2015 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD.

Members present: Eileen Tennor, Chair; Allan Shad, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Bruno Reich and Erica Zoren

Members absent:

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor and Lisa Kenney

Chairperson Tennor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Roth moved to Approve the July 3, 2015 minutes. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

*Please note the following comments and recommendations are from DPZ Staff and are recommendations for the Commission to consider, they do not represent a decision made by the Commission.

Agenda

1. 14-77c – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-80c – 8396 Park Drive, Ellicott City
3. 15-40 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
4. 15-41 – 3637 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
5. 15-42 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 15-43 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 15-44 – 8312 Main Street (Lot E), Ellicott City
8. 15-45 – 3884 Ellicott Mills, Ellicott City
9. 15-46 – 3880 Ellicott Mills, Ellicott City
10. 15-47 – 3578 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City
11. 15-48 – 3570 Courthouse Drive, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-77c – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final Tax Credit Approval.

Applicant: Len Berkowitz

Background & Scope of Work: On November 6, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to repair and resurface the existing metal roof with a weather barrier. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$7,500.00 was spent on repairs and seeks \$1,875.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-80c – 8396 Park Drive, Ellicott City

Final Tax Credit Approval.

Applicant: Tarpley Long

Background & Scope of Work: On November 6, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to replace 2 vinyl windows with wood windows, replace the roof and the structural issues and engineering work pertaining to the roof, replace front and side doors, and paint the doors window and trim. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$55,417.00 was spent on repairs and seeks \$13,854.25 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and invoices show proof of work that add up beyond this requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-40 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Install Awning.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: The exact date of construction of this building is also unknown, but it also shows up on the 1959 Sanborn maps and is not found to be significant to the historic district and is concrete block construction. The Applicant proposes to add a Black Shed awning to the storefront. The awning will be treated Sunbrella, anchored mechanically to the block wall and will have the dimensions of 12' long x 4' wide x 5' slope.

Staff Comments: The Application complies with Chapter 6.L (page 48) recommendations, “when installing awnings or canopies, use shed-style awnings that are scaled appropriately for the building size and window spacing. Awnings should be made of non-reflective canvas or another strong fabric, in a

color compatible with the building façade.” Staff recognizes that the Commission has found that awnings are not always appropriate for every building on Main Street. Staff has no objection to the installation of the awning as this building is not significant and is not visible from Main Street. The awning is of appropriate scale to the building size and window spacing; it will cover the entire length of the transom without enclosing or damaging the existing transom. The awning will be black Sunbrella and will complement the current black, grey and red colors of the exterior. Staff has no objection to the awning and believes it will bring more curb appeal to the flat façade. The awning is not a permanent change to the building and can be removed if the business was to ever leave the space.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-41 – 3637 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Install Fence.

Applicant: Joseph Hauser

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1900. The Applicant seeks retroactive approval to install a split rail fence around the rear and west side of the house. The fence is approximately 110-120 linear feet and will have a wire garden fencing to keep the Applicant’s dog contained. The fence rail will remain unfinished and will gray naturally and consist of three rail sections.

Additionally the Applicant has installed a black metal railing on the east side of the rear patio. This railing connects to the fence and will prevent injury from someone falling off the patio.

Staff Comments: Chapter 9.D (page 69) recommends split rail or post and rail fences being used in the more appropriate areas of the less densely developed areas naming several residential streets of Ellicott City. The Guidelines recommend more preservation of historic fences of granite and wrought iron when visible from the public ways. A small portion of this fence is visible from one viewpoint on Fels Lane but it is minimal. The majority of the fence is in the back yard from which this house has an addition not original to the house. The fence is simple, left unstained to blend with the environment and will be covered with vegetation. The black metal rail is a standard item used throughout Ellicott City adjacent to steps.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-42 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior Sign.

Applicant: Mark Bean

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to install a wood sign on an existing metal bracket. The sign will be 24 inches in height and 20 inches wide for a total of 3.3 square feet. The background is white and the text will be gold and dark red. The sign will be circular in graphic form with the top arch reading “COTTON Ducks” and the bottom arch reading “Art & Apparel” with the logo cotton duck in the middle of the sign.

Staff Comments: There is an existing bracket on the building from the previous tenant. The County Sign Code requires that projecting signs have a minimum clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk but this sign does not hang above the sidewalk and is not in the way of pedestrians. The sign currently has been removed every night keeping it from being a permanent sign.

The text on the sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point.” The text also complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use lettering that is between one-third and one-half of the sign height and covers no more than 75 percent of the face of the sign.”

The sign will be a wood base and is hand painted. Therefore, Staff finds the application complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

Chapter 11.B of the Guidelines recommends, “use only one projecting or hanging sign per building.” This will be the only hanging sign on the building. The Guidelines also recommend (page 84), “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.” The sign will be smaller than the recommended size.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

15-43 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior Window Sign.

Applicant: Jereme Scott

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the building dates to 1890. The Applicant seeks retroactive approval for the exterior window display of the CottonDuck logo in the storefront of 8020 Main Street.

Staff Comments: The application complies with the guideline recommendations in Chapter 11.A (page 80), “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point. In many cases, symbols or illustrations that communicate the nature of the business can be used.” The logo is white paint on glass and black painted muntins which complies with Chapter 11.A

(page 80) recommendations, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.”

Chapter 11.B (page 82) recommends against, “two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business”. The Applicant has a store sign that has the shop name and the logo. This logo is considered a second sign displaying the stores logo. The Guidelines also recommend against (page 83) “attaching letters directly to the building façade without benefit of surround, unless the letters fit within and are framed by architectural detailing.” The Guidelines also state (page 84) “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.” The logo takes up the entire storefront window and exceeds the six square feet scale. The logo is directly painted on the interior of the storefront glass and exterior of the store window muntins. Painted muntins or storefront windows are not found in the District and are not a historical feature.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the logo painted on the storefront. Approval of the sign would set a precedent of such signs throughout the District.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Mr. Jereme Scott. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Scott shared that the approved sign is removed every night and is not permanent. Ms. Tennor explained that if the sign is up every day it would not be considered temporary.

Mr. Scott explained that the muntins break up the glass in the window, which makes it hard to display art work. He also stated that painting his logo on the front of the store attracts clients to his store.

Mr. Roth asked how long the store has been open and how long the logo has been on the window. Mr. Scott said he had been open for a year and a half and the logo has been on the window since July, 2014. Mr. Roth asked if the sign had made a difference in business. Mr. Scott said it had made a big difference and was featured in several marketing publications.

Ms. Tennor asked if the painted sign was the same design as the sign that is taken down every night and why it is taken down every night. Mr. Scott said yes the design is the same. He said that he removes the other sign every night because it is a hand painted sign that is not installed high enough to not be stolen.

Ms. Tennor said that she appreciated the issue of visibility, but was not sure visibility is less than other merchants in Ellicott City and other merchants are subscribing to the Guidelines for signage, which generally call for one sign per business. Mr. Scott said that with the design of the window and muntins you cannot see into the store and consumers might think that it is empty. Ms. Tennor said that the sign seems more appropriate to the environment of a mall than a historic downtown and that it is not consistent with the Guidelines.

Mr. Reich asked if there are any precedents in Ellicott City for this type of sign. None were identified.

Ms. Tennor swore in Sherry Fackler-Berkowitz. She said that the subject business sits in a section that is difficult to attract pedestrian traffic. Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz spoke in support of the sign and that it is simplistic and not offensive. She said if there was no sign on the window, the store would look vacant.

Ms. Tennor asked Mr. Scott if something could be done with the lighting in the store to keep it from looking dark and vacant. Mr. Scott said that he has tried different things and that at night it is very

visible, but not during the day. He also stated that the design was done in a historic fashion as it was paint on glass.

Ms. Tennor said that the Commission's role is not to render judgment on its aesthetic merits, but decide if the sign is consistent with the Design Guidelines for the Historic District.

Mr. Roth moved to go into closed session and Mr. Reich seconded to obtain legal advice on "exterior appearance" and storefront windows vis-à-vis the Guidelines.

Ms. Burgess stated that the muntins are charming and create an old look, however they are not original windows and other store fronts have opened up their windows to allow for displays.

Ms. Tennor swore in Mark Bean, the owner of 8020 Main Street. Mr. Bean presented the Commission with photographs showing that the muntins were not in place originally and that it was a bay window. He also stated his opinion that the current painted sign allows the muntins to disappear and give the effect that it is one pane of glass. Ms. Tennor clarified that the muntins are not functional and just for decoration. Mr. Bean explained that they are functional as the window is no longer a single sheet of glass.

Mr. Bean stated that the six foot square rule in the Guidelines refers to hanging signs and would not apply to the painted sign. He also stated that there are not two signs for the store since the hanging sign is removed every night. Ms. Burgess explained that the six foot square rule in the Guidelines is for all signs not just hanging signs. Mr. Taylor explained that the sizing of signs are in a couple of different places in the Guidelines and that the Guidelines appropriate scale recommendations apply to all signs in the historic district. Mr. Bean states that Mr. Scott's sign reduces clutter, it is a simplified logo with one color, it minimizes the impact of the muntins, and it turns the window into a solid looking structure.

Mr. Reich stated that merchandise display is not governed by the Guidelines. Ms. Tennor clarified that whether you paint on the inside of the glass or the outside, it is still visible from the exterior as a sign. Mr. Scott stated that his merchandise is his design and his art. He asked if some sort of artwork could be displayed letting consumers know that it is an art store and that he would leave the muntins black. Mr. Reich said that would be acceptable. Mr. Reich said the Commission has to adhere to the Guidelines for everyone up and down Main Street. He explained that the size and scale of the existing sign is not in the Guidelines.

Mr. Scott asked what constitutes a display and the timeframe for a display to be considered temporary. Mr. Taylor explained that the existing sign is an issue because it is applied as an architectural element. As such, although it can be replaced, it is more permanent than having a window display.

Mr. Scott asked if he took the painting down and painted a new one on the inside of the glass and left it up for a year, would it be considered temporary display. Ms. Tennor stated that painting on the glass would be considered a sign on the window. Mr. Scott asked if he painted a sign on the window that is less than six square feet would it be acceptable. Mr. Reich clarified that there are several constraints, having more than one sign and having a sign that is too big, so both are problematic, along with the painting on the muntins.

Mr. Bean interjected that one sign is removable and therefore should be considered temporary and not counted in regards to the one sign limit recommended by the Guidelines. Mr. Taylor stated that the

Commission has to apply the Design Guidelines to the subject sign as it is a permanent installation despite the fact that it is taken down periodically.

Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz asked if artwork is allowed on the window. Mr. Taylor stated that if the window was periodically repainted, each painting would have to get a certificate of approval based on the Howard County Code. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Reich clarified that painting the window in such a way affects the exterior appearance that comes under the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Scott asked if a small vinyl sign affixed to the window would be acceptable. Mr. Roth stated that it would still be considered a second sign and would not be allowed under the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Bean stated that the reason the sign is larger than allowable is due to the location of the business. Mr. Roth asked if there are other ways to attract business. Ms. Tennor questioned the logic and necessity of the sign. Mr. Bean said that the sign draws business to the store; it is a visual appeal. Ms. Tennor stated that there is nothing in the Guidelines to cover an exception for this case.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Deny the application per staff recommendation, that the one sign is approved under the consent agenda. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimous for denial of the retroactive approval of the window sign.

15-44 – 8312 Main Street (Lot E), Ellicott City

Exterior fencing around Lot E perimeter

Applicant: Mark Richmond, Howard County Department of Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant was approved in 2014 to make improvements to Parking Lot E (behind Ellicott Mills Brewery) and construct a stairwell connecting Main Street through the parking lot to upper Court Avenue and the Courthouse. The Lot E scope of work from the previous approval is complete and the current scope is to address the perimeter fencing. Currently on site is a chain link fence that was never approved by the HPC and will be removed. There is a wood fence on the lower side of Court Ave that was constructed from boards from Talbott's historic lumberyard (HO-341) previously located at the Lot E site. The current condition of the fence is poor as many boards have fallen off or have been stolen and the Applicant recommends a black 2 foot metal railing to be mounted on top of the existing stone wall in replacement of the wood fence. The Applicants recommends the continuation of the guardrail to extend down and around the Stormwater basin area until it ends where the new metal railing will begin.

Staff Comments: The guardrail is a remedy for the safety issue of cars driving off the Court Avenue road. The guardrail style is found throughout the steep roads of Ellicott City and installed on County roads when needed. The new black metal railing is compatible with what was approved at the Feb 2014 meeting. The length of rail varies to fit the exact length and vertical drop to the existing stone wall. The posts will be 2 inch square, round top and bottom rails with half inch round pickets for a total height of 2 feet. These materials comply with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations, "construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Mr. Brian Cleary, Department of Public Works. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Cleary stated no.

Ms. Tennor swore in DeeDee Lancelotta. Ms. Lancelotta questioned the location of the proposed wrought iron railing and guardrail. Mr. Cleary, using a large site plan, explained the location of the wrought iron rail, stating that the existing chain link fence will be removed and replaced with a guardrail for safety reasons.

Ms. Zoren asked if the fencing would be actual wrought iron fencing and Mr. Cleary stated yes it would match existing wrought iron fencing in the area.

Ms. Lancelotta stated her preference for a decorative wrought iron railing instead of a view of a highway guardrail. Ms. Lancelotta stated that for safety concerns there needs to be more than just a highway guardrail installed. Ms. Tennor asked Ms. Lancelotta if her request for fencing would be to soften the view. Ms. Lancelotta stated that it would also be for safety reasons since a guardrail is low to the ground, adding a fence would be safer.

Mr. Cleary explained the intent is for pedestrians to use the sidewalk on the opposite side of the street. He also stated that there is a sharp curve which would create sight distance issues if there was a tall fence. Ms. Tennor questioned the height of the fencing and guardrail. Mr. Cleary stated that the railing is elevated on top of a stone wall.

Mr. Roth stated that the Commission can only vote on what is in the proposal. Ms. Tennor asked Ms. Lancelotta if she had objections to anything in the proposal. Ms. Lancelotta stated she objected to the installation of a guardrail.

Ms. Tennor clarified that the proposed guardrail would not be galvanized metal, but brown in color. Mr. Cleary stated that yes it would be brown and that it is being installed as a required safety measure.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to Approve the application. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-45 – 3884 Ellicott Mills, Ellicott City

Exterior Alterations: Stair Treads and Pathways.

Applicant: Lisa Wingate

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the barn at 3884 Ellicott Mills Drive dates back to 2004. The Applicant proposes the following work:

Barn and Adjacent Site Work

- 1) **Remove the stepping stones to the river and add concrete block steps with railings.** The proposed steps/tread will be same top capped bullnose concrete block used for the top of the retaining walls. The steps will be in replacement to the stones from the top of the patio down to the river's edge. A black metal double rail will be installed supported at intervals with no balusters.
- 2) **Change wood decking treads to grey Trex treads.** The stairs are constructed out of wood and will have the grey Trex tread on each step. The stairway is located to the west side of the barn starting from the driveway and leading down to the west side of barn and to the lower patio.

- 3) **Retroactive approval for the retaining wall.** Install a 2 foot retaining wall at the back of the barn patio to hold the northern hillside from erosion and run-off onto the paved patio. The wall has a 3 foot diameter half round fire pit created from existing stones unearthed during construction. Concrete block stucco wall with a bullnose concrete cap.

Staff Comments: Application #13-48 approved CR-6 gravel as a switchback path to the stream. Disturbance in the existing area is evident and large rocks are currently connecting the lower patio to the river. Staff agrees the path is unsafe for use. Regarding steps, Chapter 9.D (page 68) recommends “Original materials, which include stone, brick and wood, should be preserved. Even if the original material has been replaced by a modern alternative such as concrete, the location, size and grade of these features are often important to the settings of historic buildings.” Beyond the Guidelines, Staff has concern of infrastructure and disturbance too close to the river. Streams and Wetland Regulations state “grading, removal of vegetative cover and trees, paving, and new structures shall not be permitted within 25 feet of a wetland in any zoning district or within 50 feet of an intermittent stream bank, or 75 feet within a perennial stream bank (Use I stream as classified by MDE).” The proximity of the Applicant to the tributary stream (a Use I classification) flowing to the Patapsco main stem (a Use IV classification) is problematic for developing access to the stream with permanently installed concrete stairs. Staff recommends denial of the installation of the stairs and recommends not installing a hardscape connection to the river. If stair access to the River is determined to be allowed, staff suggests to use wood or rock steps to minimize installation and disturbance along the river’s edge.

The stairs comply with Chapter 7.B (page 54) recommendations, which states “use stained or unpainted wood (other materials from the painted wood) on the rear of the building in a location not facing or highly visible from a public way. Although the treads are obviously modern, the proposed stair treads will be to the west of the barn not visible from any view except for someone standing on the stairs or seen from the lower patio area which is not a public view. The construction of the stairs including supports and stringers are all made of wood. Only the tread which cannot be seen from any view or distance is the grey Trex. Staff recommends approval of treads because it is not in view of public way, nor is it located at the front of any buildings.

Chapter 9.D (page 70) states to “construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.” And “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” The Guidelines state “build a new retaining wall no more than 2 feet high and 12 feet long.” Staff recommends approval of the 2 foot retaining wall with the concrete bullnose capping. The wall is aiding the support of the steep slope and collecting the run-off to the stream. The wall is not visible from public way and is in keeping with the color and materials of the historic district and features on site. The fire pit is made of indigenous rock and is placed in the center of the wall.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends retroactive approval for #2 and #3, the wall and the treads but recommends denial of the installation of concrete steps to the river.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Ms. Lisa Wingate and Mr. Steensen. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Wingate explained the layout of the subject property and historical background.

Ms. Tennor suggested a site plan be submitted with every application, regardless if it has been before the Commission previously so that new Commission members would have accurate information.

Ms. Wingate stated that the current stone stairs leading from the property down to the stream are dangerous and the homeowner would like to be able to access the stream. Ms. Wingate stated the applicant would like to use a more modern material of concrete bullnose. Ms. Tennor asked if the stairs would be a straight staircase. Ms. Wingate stated no and explained it would follow the current topography of the existing pathway.

Ms. Wingate explained that if the Commission would not approve the concrete steps, the applicant would need to replace several stones along the stairs as well as install a railing for safety reasons. She explained that the rail would be a very simple wrought iron rail on newels. Ms. Wingate explained item #2 would be to add Trex treads on existing wooden stairs and item #3 would be the retaining wall. She stated the applicant would like to install a retaining wall at the back of the patio due to steep topography. She also stated that the retaining wall cannot be seen from Main Street.

Mr. Roth asked the origin of the existing stone path down to the river. Ms. Wingate stated that a pathway existed, however the applicant added the stones from the property.

Mr. Reich stated that the application is missing details, such as a site plan or sample materials, making it hard to visualize.

Ms. Tennor asked about previously approved plans in HPC 13-48 regarding a switchback path. Ms. Wingate explained that there was a plan for a switchback path to be built, however it was abandoned due to difficulty maintaining the path because of run-off from the subject property.

Ms. Tennor questioned the compatibility of the application and the Commission's responsibility versus the restrictions that are referenced in the staff report. Mr. Reich stated that the Commission does not have any purview regarding SWM and zoning issues. He also stated that the applicant should come back to the Commission and bring a site plan of the yard with more details. Ms. Wingate stated that the applicant is just replacing existing stones with concrete bullnose and that the topography of the path would remain intact. Ms. Zoren asked if the bullnose would be installed on the dirt or would there be a foundation or structure. It was not clear what the foundation would be.

Mr. Shad stated that more information is needed, showing all the existing structures as well as the proposed structures with different options for the stairs.

Ms. Wingate stated the proposal is for a black metal top railing. The Commission asked for details regarding the railing to be included in the application. Ms. Tennor stated that a plan showing the location of the path relative to the rest of the property would be helpful. Ms. Wingate stated that the Department of Planning and Zoning does have a site plan on file and that the applicant was not aware that a plan was needed. She also stated that she does have a sketch however it would not show the steps or the retaining wall or the existing topography. Mr. Roth suggested that the Howard County website has a GIS site where the applicant could locate the subject property with property lines showing the topography of the subject property.

Mr. Reich stated that he had no problems with the proposal, however documentation for the file is important. Mr. Taylor asked if the applicant would be willing to continue item #1 and have the commission consider items #2 and #3. Ms. Wingate answered yes.

Mr. Roth moved to Approve items #2 and #3. Mr. Reich stated that all of the items should be provided on a site plan by the applicant and continued until the next meeting.

Ms. Tennor stated that she had no objection to the retaining wall and would move to Approve it.

The application for the stairs to the river was continued to the September 3rd HPC meeting with the applicant's consent.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve item #2 and #3, the grey Trex and the retaining wall and fire pit with the stipulation that the retaining wall will be included on a site plan that will be on file with the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-46 – 3880 Ellicott Mills, Ellicott City

Exterior Alterations: Porch Railings and Retroactive Patio Steps.

Applicant: Lisa Wingate

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the historic house dates to 1800. The Applicant proposes to replace rotting wood on the porch railing and paint white to match. The Applicant seeks retroactive approval of the installation of three steps made of gray pavers.

Staff Comments: The addition of the white wood pickets and railing could be considered similar to a recommendation from Chapter 7.B (page 54), which states, "design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building, and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height" and "on historic buildings, construct porches of painted wood." Staff considers this in-kind work and recommends approval.

HPC application 15-11 approved the removal of the existing rear patio and the excavation to lower the grade to accommodate the addition. The proposed paving materials for the terraced gardens, patio, retaining walls, walkway, barn patio/driveway and retaining wall are all consistent with Chapter 9.D recommendations, "construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures" and "construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone." The site work will not be visible from a public way, but complies with the Guidelines. The steps added to this patio are the same material as the patio pavers approved at #15-11 meeting. Staff recommends retroactive approval of work.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of in-kind railing replacement and retroactive approval of the patio steps as submitted.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Ms. Lisa Wingate. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Wingate stated that the application is for three steps not two.

Ms. Wingate explained the history of the additions to the historic site as well as the approvals for the additions. She stated the topography in the rear of the structure was changed due to existing site conditions which required three steps and not two. Ms. Wingate explained that once the master bedroom addition was completed it was determined that the patio needed to be lowered. The existing brick patio had to be ripped up in order for BGE to install a gas line. The applicant retained approval to lower the patio and the gray paver material previously from the Commission.

Ms. Wingate stated the applicant is asking to replace a small piece of rotting wood originally built in 1990, so it would be routine maintenance.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve the application. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-47 -3578 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

Gutter and Porch Repairs. Tax Credits

Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Hade; Mr. & Mrs. Suter

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the building dates to 1905. The Applicant seeks approval for the following work. The Applicant will repair decayed fascia, soffit and rake boards with replacing them with wood grain aluminum covering yellow pine boards to match existing shape and dimensions. Soffit will be "Triple four Solid V-panel" similar in appearance to the porch ceiling. All the existing gutters which vary in size and shape will be replaced to a uniform 6 inch k-style white aluminum gutter. The wood tongue and groove porch will be replaced with light grey 3 inch tongue and groove PVC flooring. Along the foundation of the house the "water-table" drip edge will be replaced with aluminum covered pressure treated yellow pine. Applicant seeks tax credit for porch floor and gutters.

Staff Comments: Staff recognizes that although this property is within the historic district, it is located on Sylvan lane on the outer edge of the district and not very visible from the road. Staff confirms rotting fascia boards and peeling paint during site visit but believes prime and painted wood is the best replacement for all the trim, fascia and rake boards on the home. Using wood materials that are properly prepared will be eligible for the 25% tax credit. Chapter 6.J (page 44) states "Replace deteriorated features with materials as similar to the original as possible". Replacing wood with new yellow pine and wrapping with aluminum will not guarantee a maintenance free treatment because insects and water can still have access to the non-treated wood behind the aluminum.

Staff does not recommend the approval of the Applicants soffits. Primed and painted wood soffits would be most appropriate for this house as per Chapter 6.J. If ventilation is needed, small round vents can be installed in the wood soffit. The wood soffit allows for the drip edge that would not exist on the aluminum wrapped wood. Chapter 6.D recommendations, "composite siding materials may be used to replace wood siding on non-historic building if the particular material proposed is compatible in appearance with the building itself and with wood siding used on nearby historic buildings." Staff would recommend a Hardie-board composite material for the soffits in lieu of aluminum modern soffits but this is a 1905 historic home.

Chapter 6.F (page 34) of the Guidelines recommends for the use of similar materials to the original and recommends against, "adding or replacing porch features using materials not appropriate to the building's style. Materials generally not appropriate for historic porch replacements include unpainted pressure treated wood, poured concrete and metal." Chapter 7.B (page 54) states, "on historic buildings, construct porches of painted wood." Staff recommends a prime and painted wood tongue and groove porch replacement. If the Applicant doesn't want paint maintenance, Staff recommends different varieties of wood such as Ipe, a water resistant Brazilian hardwood, which if used, would not be painted. Staff did note on site visit that the enclosure of the porch has caused porch drainage issues and recommends remedying the drainage and support issue before the porch is replaced. Proper drainage would reduce the rot of new porch. The fascia board of the porch and perhaps the porch sill and structural supports of the porch may need repair prior to the porch replacement. Staff objects to using Trex composite on the front porch of a historic home and does not recommend tax credits for this repair if wood materials are not used.

The replacement of the gutters comply with Chapter 6.E recommendations, “use gutters and downspouts of painted metal or prefinished aluminum in a color consistent with the building’s exterior walls or trim. Locate downspouts along natural vertical lines and corners of the building.” Staff recommends using half round gutters throughout the historic home as this style is more appropriate for the home. But Staff does not object to the 6 inch K-style gutter as submitted by Applicant. Gutters are eligible for Tax credits.

Chapter 6.C (page 26) recommends, “maintain or restore granite buildings, foundations, steps, lintels, sills, fence posts and retaining walls,” and are considered an eligible expense per Section 20.112 of the County Code. Staff recommends using painted pressure treated wood with a beveled edge for the drip edge sills instead of the aluminum wrapped pine.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval and 25 % tax credit for all work using wood replacement to the front porch, all new aluminum gutters, wood painted fascia boards, bevel edged pressure treated wood drip edge and any structural support related to the porch replacement. Staff recommends against tax credits if porch is not a wood replacement and if any of the repairs are done with aluminum wrap or materials items such as Trex, composite, or PVC board.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Mr. Charles Suter and Ms. Nancy Suter. Ms. Tennor asked if there were corrections to the Staff comments.

Mr. Suter agreed with staff recommendation for the Hardie board for the soffit area. He stated that the unpainted wood would not blend in with the existing structure. Ms. Suter stated that they would like to be able to install the PVC that looks like the wood for the porch. Ms. Tennor clarified that the applicant would not get the tax credit for the PVC product, however if the Commission approved it, the material could be used. Ms. Burgess clarified staff recommendation was for the rake board and fascia to be constructed with painted wood.

Mr. Reich questioned whether the applicants would be willing to do the fascia board and decking out of real wood. Mr. Suter stated his strong preference for composite for the actual decking. Ms. Suter questioned if her son-in-law wanted to go with wood to get the tax credit, then would the application need to be changed. Mr. Reich stated that the application could be changed by the Commission or the applicant can contact Staff. Mr. Taylor clarified Commission could approve Trek decking with option to use the wood and include the tax credit pre approval.

Mr. Reich stated that the decking cannot be seen from the road and he would like to allow the applicant to use the Trex decking if so desired, but without allowing tax credit if the Trek decking is used. He encouraged the applicant to use the original materials of wood for fascia and decking and get the 25% tax credits for all of the work.

Ms. Tennor stated that consistently the Commission requires the front porch to be wood in a historic district. Mr. Suter explained that originally his property was not part of the historic district.

Ms. Tennor stated her approval would be for wood, new aluminum gutters, wood painted fascia boards as the staff recommends.

Mr. Taylor asked the applicant if they are willing to amend their application to make the porch be wood. Mr. and Ms. Suter stated yes.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve the staff recommendation including the requirement to use wood for the porch. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

15-48 – 3570 Court House Drive, Ellicott City

Advisory Comments for Site Development Plan Adjacent to Ellicott City Historic District

Applicant: Robert H. Vogel Engineering, Inc

Background & Scope of Work: This property is not historic, but is located adjacent to the Ellicott City Historic District, and therefore requires Advisory Comments for the proposed site development plan. The site consists of 3.39 acres along Fels Lane and Court House Drive. There are three existing apartment buildings to be demolished and three new buildings will be constructed. The number of units will remain the same; there will be 60 total units.

Staff Comments: The proposed plan will have the apartment buildings on the outer edge of the property to allow for the majority of the parking lot to be more hidden from the road. All three building's fronts face out to the community and adjacent roads. There are five retaining walls and based on the plan range from 2 feet to 29 feet. The shorter walls are around the entrances and building. The larger wall is in the center of the parcel dividing the parking and the building #1 to building #2 and #3. The walls will be the stacked Keystone Compac in color Toffee/ Onyx. Staff recognizes this parcel slope varies 40 feet in height, 50 feet including SWM basins and agrees the retaining walls should be placed internally to the community within the parking area and not adjacent to the edge of property or the buildings.

Staff strongly recommends the Applicant consider switching the stone veneer façade with where the fiber cement siding is installed and vice versa, have the fiber cement siding be placed where the stone veneer is proposed. Historically, like in Ellicott City, the main block of a building would be made of stone. Additions and pop outs that are currently depicted in the plans as stone would historically be framed additions and traditionally covered with clapboard. Switching the building materials would be more consistent to the historic structures. Additionally, the two and three tone of fiber cement siding is a modern trend that will date this design. Staff recommends the Applicant choose one color of siding for the entire complex or at least for each building and eliminate the two-tone siding that is currently proposed. The result of the building exterior will consist of stone veneer with one color of siding. The railings appear white painted metal in elevations. Staff recommends black metal railings to complement the railings of the historic district.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the salvaging and reuse of as many construction materials both on the interior and the exterior of the apartment units to reduce landfill volumes. Staff recommends the switching of exterior building materials as described in comments to create a timeless design that is more appropriate to the historic architecture. Staff recommends using black metal railings throughout the community.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Mr. Vogel, Civil Engineer; Steele Bergman, Architect; Marc Ervin, Howard County Engineer; and Scott Link, Developer. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Vogel stated that revising the material to the greatest extent possible will be incorporated into the design. He also agreed with the reuse of materials and recycling of materials.

Ms. Tennor asked the amount of parking places for the proposed project. Mr. Vogel explained that they tried to achieve 1.5 to 1.8 parking spaces per unit, which are below Howard County's published numbers and that the numbers are based on a study done by The Traffic Group, where counts are taken daytime,

evening and weekends. Ms. Tennor asked if providing adequate parking was one of the objectives of the project and Mr. Vogel stated yes. Mr. Roth questioned the amount of parking required by zoning for the subject project. Mr. Vogel stated the parking required by the Zoning Regulations is 2.5 spaces per unit and the subject project is 1.8 spaces per unit.

Ms. Tennor asked if it was an objective to locate parking on the interior perimeter. Mr. Vogel stated yes. Ms. Tennor asked if the footprints of the buildings are comparable to the existing footprints in terms of square footage. Mr. Bergman stated yes the square footage would be the same. Ms. Tennor stated the scale of the proposed buildings is similar to the existing buildings, however the existing configuration allows a generous setback from Fels Lane. The proposed configuration place the new buildings right against Fels Lane, so the mass would be very dramatic compared to the little houses across the street, leaving a minimal tree buffer.

Mr. Roth asked if the applicant will be applying for a zoning variance for the parking. Mr. Vogel stated that it will not be a variance but a 'parking needs' analysis would be required. The analysis from The Traffic Group would be provided.

Mr. Vogel explained the existing vegetation along Fels Lane on the project side of the street should remain intact.

Mr. Reich questioned the location of the retaining walls. Mr. Vogel explained the layout of the project and location of retaining walls. He stated the parking lot is 20 feet higher than the bioretention facilities and stairs would be built to connect the areas. He further explained the design was such so that the large retaining wall was not visible from outside of the community. Ms. Zoren questioned the materials of the walls. Mr. Vogel stated it will be keystone interlocking block with geogrid tiebacks. Ms. Tennor clarified that the blocks would be the same as the existing with two color choices.

Mr. Vogel stated existing impervious surfaces are very similar in the proposed project and the big difference would be the installation of full onsite stormwater management. He explained the various stormwater management improvements on the subject site. Mr. Shad questioned how long the stormwater management part of the project will take to complete. Mr. Vogel estimated about four weeks of construction and stated the trenches will be covered up with metal plates each evening.

Ms. Burgess clarified that any road, curb or gutter work done in the Historic District would be under the Commission's purview like retaining the granite curbs on Fels Lane. Mr. Shad asked if materials being removed would be replaced with suitable materials. Mr. Vogel answered yes and explained that the work would mainly be in the paved areas not the granite curb area.

Mr. Shad asked about utilizing the same footprint as it currently exists. Mr. Vogel explained the poor drainage problems of the existing site left the lower units uninhabitable.

Ms. Tennor clarified the new organization of the site is to create a better drain system for the site. Mr. Vogel stated the design is much improved. Ms. Tennor asked about the existing trees along the street, and if there would there be additional landscaping. Mr. Vogel stated that was discussed at the community meeting and additional landscape will be provided for the existing residents on Fels Lane.

Mr. Shad stated his concern regarding the scale of the proposed buildings looming over Fels Lane.

Ms. Zoren asked if buildings two and three could be two equal sizes. Mr. Vogel stated the site is topographically challenged and the buildings could not be made the same size. He also explained that access to the adjacent Withers property had to be accommodated via the parking lot. The new proposed access is a much better solution than what currently exists.

Ms. Tennor swore in Bill Withers, a Fels Lane resident. Mr. Withers stated his concerns regarding setbacks of the proposed buildings and the looming buildings devaluing the adjacent properties. Mr. Withers stated that he agrees with the project concept, however not the site layout.

Ms. Tennor swore in Julia Hawrylo, a Fels Lane resident. Ms. Hawrylo stated her agreement with Mr. Withers concerns.

Ms. Tennor swore in Anne Eustis, a Fels Lane resident. Ms. Eustis stated her concerns that some tenants of the existing buildings would not be able to return to reside there after construction.

Mr. Withers read a statement from Kerry Lessard, a Fels Lane resident, stating her concerns with the proposed project.

Ms. Tennor clarified that the Commission can only offer advisory comments.

Ms. Zoren suggested setting buildings back from Fels Lane and addressing the size of buildings two and three as well as possibly adding a front porch. She also stated that reducing the footprint might alleviate some issues with the large retaining walls and positioning so close to the street. Ms. Zoren noted the HVAC unit locations and suggested removing them from view of Fels Lane and put them on the roof. Ms. Zoren stated her agreement with Staff comments and that the base of the building should be a heavier stone material.

Mr. Reich stated his agreement with staff comments and was satisfied that Stormwater management concerns on the site would be fixed. He also stated his concerns that the complex would look suburban and not suited for a historic district. Mr. Reich suggested the buildings be pushed back from Fels Lane and the architecture should be more compatible with a historic district.

Mr. Roth stated that the proposal was not respectful of the neighboring community and that he agreed with Mr. Reich regarding the suburban look of the proposed project.

Mr. Reich moved to Adjourn the meeting. Mr. Shad seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Mr. Allan Shad, Vice-Chairperson

Lisa Kenney, Recording Secretary

T:\Shared\RCD\HPC\Minutes\2015 Minutes\08 August Minutes.docx